

REMARKS

This responds to the Final Office Action mailed on March 4, 2009.

Claims 1, 6, and 9 are amended, no claims are canceled, and claim 17 was added; as a result, claims 1-17 are now pending in this application. Support for the new claim 17 can be found in Fig. 4 showing three private address ranges as defined by IETF regulation.

§ 103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-4, 9-12, and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant admitted prior art ‘AAPA’ (fig. 1), and in view of Furukawa (U.S. 2006/0036768).

The Final Office Action reiterated the arguments previously set forth in an earlier communication, stating that independent claims are obvious in view of a prior art system depicted in Figure 1 of the current application and Furukawa.

With respect to the prior art approaches, the current application states that existing conventional IT system environments are server oriented, with each server having one unique IP address, as illustrated in Figure 1. [0006] Furukawa, at paragraph 6, discusses destination addresses being located in a private address range or in a non-private address range, and packet filters that can forward or discard a packet based on its destination address being from a private or non-private address range. (Furukawa, [0048] - [0051].) Furukawa, while referring to multiple address ranges and a filtering approach that is based on the destination address range, does not disclose a system where a single server network segment is assigned or can be assigned both a private address range and a non-private address range. There is no reason to believe that, in Furukawa, a server LAN that is part of the internal area of ICS is assigned more than one address range. Therefore, combining Figure 1 of the current application with Furukawa that does not contemplate a possibility of assigning two address ranges to a single server does not yield a system where one server system is assigned two address ranges. Claim 1 was amended to clarify that the server network segment is associated with a single server system.

Thus, because the combination of Furukawa and AAPA fail to disclose or suggest "the server network segment [associated with a single server system] being assigned at least one second access address range and at least one third access address range, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range and the at least one third access address range is a shared address range representing at least a sub-range of the at least one first access address range, each of the plurality of services being assigned one access address within the shared address range or the exclusive address range and the router being set up to route packets on the basis of respective addresses associated with packets being within the shared access address range and to block packets on the basis of respective addresses being from the exclusive address range." Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable and should be allowed. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims be withdrawn.

The reasons articulated above are applicable, mutatis mutandis, to claims 6 and 9. Thus, claim 6, 9, and their respective dependent claims are patentable in view of the cited combination and should be allowed. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 8 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over 'AAPA' and Furukawa as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, in further view of Lakshman et al. (U.S. 5,951,651).

Lakshman describes a filter method for designating packet filter rules contained in a router (Lakshman, Abstract.) Claims 5 and 8, and claim 13 depend on claims 1 and 9 respectively and therefore are patentable in view of the combination of AAPA and Furukawa for the reasons discussed above. Combining AAPA and Furukawa with Lakshman does not cure the deficiencies of the previously-discussed AAPA and Furukawa combination with respect to features present in claims 5, 8, and 13 by virtue of their being dependent on their respective dependent claims. Applicants therefore request the reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claims 5, 8, and 13.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (408) 278-4042 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or deficiencies, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(408) 278-4042

Date April 23, 2009

By /Elena Dreszer/
Elena B. Dreszer
Reg. No. 55,128

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 23rd day of March, 2009.

Dawn R. Shaw
Name

/Dawn R. Shaw/
Signature